

SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Claims 1-3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Potter reference (US Patent No. 5,697,614) that we cited to the PTO.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Jones et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,861,041, Caribbean Stud® poker).

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the Jones et al. reference.

Claims 4, 10, 11 and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821, cited by the PTO).

Claim 12 has have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821, cited by the PTO) in further view of Lott (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,011).

Claims 6, 13, 14, 20 and 21 have have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821, cited by the PTO) and further in view of Jones et al.